

**GUIDANCE**  
**ON**  
**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS**  
**UNDER SECTION 1003(g) OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION**  
**ACT OF 1965**



U.S. Department of Education  
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

December 18, 2009

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>PURPOSE OF THIS GUIDANCE .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>A. DEFINITIONS .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>A-1. What is the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools”? .....</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>A-2. Does a Title I high school need to meet both the requirements in paragraphs (a)(i) and (a)(ii) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” set forth in A-1 to be identified? .....</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>A-3. What factors must an SEA consider to identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State? .....</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>A-4. For purposes of identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State, what assessments does an SEA use to determine academic achievement and lack of progress? .....</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>A-5. For purposes of identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools in a State, what is the “all students” group? .....</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>A-6. For purposes of identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools in a State, which students does an SEA include to determine the percentage of students who are proficient in a school? .....</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>A-7. In determining proficiency of the “all students” group, does an SEA include students who are above proficient? .....</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>A-8. For purposes of identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools in a State, what is a secondary school? .....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>A-9. For purposes of identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools in a State, what does it mean to be a secondary school “that is eligible for” Title I funds? .....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>A-10. As used in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools,” how many years make up a “number of years”? .....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>A-11. From among which sets of schools must an SEA identify the lowest-achieving five percent or the lowest-achieving five schools? .....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>A-12. May an SEA weight differently the two factors it must consider in identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools (i.e., academic achievement of the “all students” group and lack of progress on the State’s assessments)? .....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>A-13. In ranking its schools on the basis of each school’s academic achievement results of the “all students” group and lack of progress on the State’s assessments for purposes of identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State, may an SEA give different weight to its secondary schools and its elementary schools? .....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>A-14. May an SEA take into account other factors in addition to those that it must consider in identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools? .....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>A-15. How can an SEA determine academic achievement in terms of proficiency of the “all students” group on the State’s reading/language arts and mathematics assessments combined to develop one list of schools that will enable it to identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State? .....</i>	<i>4</i>

A-16.	<i>For purposes of identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools, how can an SEA determine whether a school has demonstrated a “lack of progress over a number of years” on the State’s assessments?.....</i>	<i>6</i>
A-17.	<i>What is the complete sequence of steps an SEA should use to develop its final list of the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State? .....</i>	<i>7</i>
A-18.	<i>What is the definition of “increased learning time”?.....</i>	<i>9</i>
A-19.	<i>Does the definition of “increased learning time” include before- or after-school instructional programs? ....</i>	<i>10</i>
A-20.	<i>What is the definition of “student growth”?.....</i>	<i>10</i>
A-21.	<i>Why is it necessary to define “student growth” for purposes of SIG grants?.....</i>	<i>10</i>
A-22.	<i>Do provisions related to SIG funds in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010 affect the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” or the school intervention models?.....</i>	<i>10</i>
<b>B.</b>	<b>TURNAROUND MODEL .....</b>	<b>11</b>
B-1.	<i>What are the required elements of a turnaround model?.....</i>	<i>11</i>
B-2.	<i>In addition to the required elements, what optional elements may also be a part of a turnaround model? .</i>	<i>11</i>
B-3.	<i>What is the definition of “staff” as that term is used in the discussion of a turnaround model? .....</i>	<i>12</i>
B-4.	<i>What are “locally adopted competencies”?.....</i>	<i>12</i>
B-5.	<i>Is an LEA implementing the turnaround model required to use financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible conditions as strategies to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a turnaround model?.....</i>	<i>13</i>
B-6.	<i>What is job-embedded professional development?.....</i>	<i>13</i>
B-7.	<i>Does the requirement to implement an instructional program that is research-based and aligned (vertically and with State standards) require adoption of a new or revised instructional program? .....</i>	<i>14</i>
B-8.	<i>What are examples of social-emotional and community-oriented services that may be supported with SIG funds in a school operating a schoolwide program?.....</i>	<i>14</i>
B-9.	<i>May an LEA omit any of the actions outlined in the final requirements and implement its own version of a turnaround model?.....</i>	<i>14</i>
<b>C.</b>	<b>RESTART MODEL .....</b>	<b>14</b>
C-1.	<i>What is the definition of a restart model? .....</i>	<i>14</i>
C-2.	<i>What is a CMO?.....</i>	<i>14</i>
C-3.	<i>What is an EMO?.....</i>	<i>15</i>
C-4.	<i>Prior to submitting its application for SIG funds, must an LEA know the particular EMO or CMO with which it would contract to restart a school? .....</i>	<i>15</i>

C-5.	<i>What is the purpose of the “rigorous review process” used for selecting a charter school operator, a CMO, or an EMO?.....</i>	<i>15</i>
C-6.	<i>Which students must be permitted to enroll in a school implementing a restart model?.....</i>	<i>15</i>
C-7.	<i>May a restart school serve fewer grades than were previously served by the school in which the model is being implemented?.....</i>	<i>15</i>
C-8.	<i>May a school implementing a restart model implement any of the required or permissible activities of a turnaround model or a transformation model?.....</i>	<i>16</i>
C-9.	<i>If an LEA implements a restart model, must its contract with the charter school operator, CMO, or EMO hold the charter school operator, CMO, or EMO accountable for meeting the final requirements? .....</i>	<i>16</i>
<b>D.</b>	<b>SCHOOL CLOSURE.....</b>	<b>16</b>
D-1.	<i>What is the definition of “school closure”?.....</i>	<i>16</i>
D-2.	<i>What costs associated with closing a school can be paid for with SIG funds?.....</i>	<i>16</i>
D-3.	<i>May SIG funds be used in the school that is receiving students who previously attended a school that is subject to closure in order to cover the costs associated with accommodating those students?.....</i>	<i>17</i>
D-4.	<i>Is the portion of an LEA’s SIG subgrant that is to be used to implement a school closure renewable?....</i>	<i>17</i>
D-5.	<i>How can an LEA determine whether a higher-achieving school is within reasonable proximity to a closed school?.....</i>	<i>17</i>
D-6.	<i>In what kinds of schools may students who previously attended a closed school enroll?.....</i>	<i>18</i>
<b>E.</b>	<b>TRANSFORMATION MODEL .....</b>	<b>18</b>
E-1.	<i>With respect to elements of the transformation model that are the same as elements of the turnaround model, do the definitions and other guidance that apply to those elements as they relate to the turnaround model also apply to those elements as they relate to the transformation model? .....</i>	<i>18</i>
E-2.	<i>Which activities related to developing and increasing teacher and school leader effectiveness are required for an LEA implementing a transformation model? .....</i>	<i>18</i>
E-3.	<i>Must the principal and teachers involved in the development and design of the evaluation system be the principal and teachers in the school in which the transformation model is being implemented? .....</i>	<i>19</i>
E-4.	<i>Under the final requirements, an LEA implementing the transformation model must remove staff “who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so.” Does an LEA have discretion to determine the appropriate number of such opportunities that must be provided and what are some examples of such “opportunities” to improve?.....</i>	<i>19</i>
E-5.	<i>In addition to the required activities, what other activities related to developing and increasing teacher and school leader effectiveness may an LEA undertake as part of its implementation of a transformation model?.....</i>	<i>19</i>

E-6.	<i>How does the optional activity of “providing additional compensation to attract and retain” certain staff differ from the requirement to implement strategies designed to recruit, place, and retain certain staff?.....</i>	<i>20</i>
E-7.	<i>Which activities related to comprehensive instructional reform strategies are required as part of the implementation of a transformation model?.....</i>	<i>20</i>
E-8.	<i>In addition to the required activities, what other activities related to comprehensive instructional reform strategies may an LEA undertake as part of its implementation of a transformation model? .....</i>	<i>20</i>
E-9.	<i>What activities related to increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools are required for implementation of a transformation model?.....</i>	<i>21</i>
E-10.	<i>What is meant by the phrase “family and community engagement” and what are some examples of ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement?.....</i>	<i>21</i>
E-11.	<i>In addition to the required activities, what other activities related to increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools may an LEA undertake as part of its implementation of a transformation model?.....</i>	<i>21</i>
E-12.	<i>How does the optional activity of extending or restructuring the school day to add time for strategies that build relationships between students, faculty, and other school staff differ from the requirement to provide increased learning time?.....</i>	<i>22</i>
E-13.	<i>What activities related to providing operational flexibility and sustained support are required for implementation of a transformation model?.....</i>	<i>22</i>
E-14.	<i>Must an LEA implementing the transformation model in a school give the school operational flexibility in the specific areas of staffing, calendars/ time, and budgeting? .....</i>	<i>22</i>
E-15.	<i>In addition to the required activities, what other activities related to providing operational flexibility and sustained support may an LEA undertake as part of its implementation of a transformation model?....</i>	<i>22</i>
<b>F.</b>	<b>CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES .....</b>	<b>23</b>
F-1.	<i>How may an LEA implement the turnaround, school closure, restart, or transformation intervention models in a Tier I school operating a targeted assistance program? .....</i>	<i>23</i>
F-2.	<i>What is the timeline for implementing an intervention model in a Tier I or Tier II school using FY 2009 funds? .....</i>	<i>23</i>
F-3.	<i>What requirements that apply to schools receiving Title I, Part A funds apply to schools that receive SIG funds? .....</i>	<i>24</i>
F-4.	<i>How do the Title I supplement not supplant requirements apply to SIG funds allocated under section 1003(g) of the ESEA?.....</i>	<i>24</i>
F-5.	<i>What action must an LEA take if it receives SIG funds to implement one of the four models in a particular school and subsequently is unable to implement the model in that school? .....</i>	<i>25</i>
F-6.	<i>May an LEA use SIG funds for general district-level improvement activities?.....</i>	<i>25</i>

F-7.	<i>How can an LEA ensure that it is able to implement fully and effectively all required components of a selected school intervention model, given that some components may be affected by collective bargaining agreements or other contracts?</i> .....	25
F-8.	<i>What are an SEA's responsibilities for ensuring proper implementation of SIG grants?</i> .....	26
F-9.	<i>May an SEA require an LEA to adopt a particular model for a particular school?</i> .....	26
F-10.	<i>Is an SEA or LEA that receives SIG funds required to comply with applicable Federal civil rights laws?</i> .....	26
<b>G. PROVIDING FLEXIBILITY</b> .....		26
G-1.	<i>May an SEA award SIG funds to an LEA for a Tier I or Tier II school that has implemented, in whole or in part, a turnaround model, restart model, or transformation model within the last two years?</i> .....	26
G-2.	<i>May an SEA award SIG funds to an LEA for a Tier III school that has implemented, in whole or in part, a turnaround model, restart model, or transformation model within the last two years so that the LEA and school can continue or complete their implementation of the model?</i> .....	27
G-3.	<i>What would the new improvement timeline be for a school implementing a school improvement timeline waiver of section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA?</i> .....	27
G-4.	<i>How does an SEA's receipt of a waiver of section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) to extend the period of availability of SIG funds affect an LEA seeking SIG funds?</i> .....	27
G-5.	<i>If an SEA receives a waiver of section 421(b) of GEPA to extend the period of availability of SIG funds, for how long will the funds be available?</i> .....	27
G-6.	<i>What is the process for an SEA to apply for the waivers discussed in the final requirements?</i> .....	27
G-7.	<i>What is the process for an LEA to request approval to implement a SIG-related waiver granted to an SEA?</i> .....	28
G-8.	<i>Prior to applying for one or more of the waivers discussed in the final requirements through the submission of its application for SIG funds, must an SEA comply with the notice-and-comment requirements in section 9401 of the ESEA?</i> .....	28
G-9.	<i>Must an SEA seek any of the waivers discussed in the final requirements?</i> .....	28
G-10.	<i>If an SEA does not seek one or more of the waivers discussed in the final requirements, may an LEA seek those waivers directly from the Department?</i> .....	28
<b>H. LEA REQUIREMENTS</b> .....		28
H-1.	<i>Must an LEA that previously submitted an approved SIG application that is eligible for renewal submit a new application for FY 2009 funds?</i> .....	29
H-2.	<i>What must an LEA include in its application to the SEA for SIG funds?</i> .....	29
H-3.	<i>Must an LEA identify every Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school located within the LEA in its application for SIG funds?</i> .....	30

H-4.	<i>If an LEA wishes to serve a Tier III school, must it provide SIG funds directly to the school?.....</i>	<i>30</i>
H-5.	<i>Are there any particular school improvement strategies that an LEA must implement in its Tier III schools? .....</i>	<i>30</i>
H-6.	<i>May an LEA use SIG funds to continue to implement school improvement strategies that do not meet the requirements of one of the four models but that have helped improve achievement in the LEA? .....</i>	<i>30</i>
H-7.	<i>May an LEA implement several of the school intervention models among the Tier I and Tier II schools it commits to serve? .....</i>	<i>31</i>
H-8.	<i>How can an LEA demonstrate that it has the capacity to use SIG funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve in order to implement fully and effectively one of the four school intervention models? .....</i>	<i>31</i>
H-9.	<i>How can an LEA use “external providers” to turn around its persistently lowest-achieving schools? .....</i>	<i>31</i>
H-10.	<i>What are examples of “other resources” an LEA might align with the interventions it commits to implement using SIG funds? .....</i>	<i>31</i>
H-11.	<i>What is the cap on the number of schools in which an LEA may implement the transformation model and to which LEAs does it apply? .....</i>	<i>32</i>
H-12.	<i>May an LEA use SIG funds to serve a school that feeds into a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school, but is not itself a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school? .....</i>	<i>32</i>
H-13.	<i>What criteria must an LEA use to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that receives SIG funds?.....</i>	<i>32</i>
H-14.	<i>What are examples of the annual goals for student achievement that an LEA must establish? .....</i>	<i>32</i>
H-15.	<i>What are the leading indicators that will be used to hold schools receiving SIG funds accountable? .....</i>	<i>33</i>
<b>I.</b>	<b>SEA REQUIREMENTS .....</b>	<b>33</b>
I-1.	<i>What must an SEA do to receive a SIG grant? .....</i>	<i>33</i>
I-2.	<i>Before approving an LEA’s application, what factors must an SEA consider to determine whether the application meets the final requirements? .....</i>	<i>34</i>
I-3.	<i>May an SEA require an LEA to implement a particular intervention in one or more of its schools?.....</i>	<i>35</i>
I-4.	<i>May an SEA develop a needs assessment tool or rubric for all of its LEAs to use in determining which intervention will best address the needs of the Tier I and Tier II schools it commits to serve? .....</i>	<i>35</i>
I-5.	<i>What information related to the SIG program must an SEA post on its Web site? .....</i>	<i>35</i>
I-6.	<i>May an SEA award an LEA a lesser amount of SIG funds than the LEA requests in its application? .....</i>	<i>35</i>
I-7.	<i>What are examples of additional criteria an SEA may use to differentiate among Tier III schools when setting priorities among LEA applications for funding? .....</i>	<i>36</i>
I-8.	<i>May an SEA take over an LEA or specific Tier I or Tier II schools? .....</i>	<i>36</i>

I-9.	<i>What SIG funds may an SEA use to implement a school intervention model in a Tier I or Tier II school it has taken over? .....</i>	<i>36</i>
I-10.	<i>Under what circumstances may an SEA provide services directly to an eligible school? .....</i>	<i>36</i>
I-11.	<i>If a Tier I or Tier II school meets the annual student achievement goals established by the LEA and makes progress on the leading indicators, must the SEA renew the LEA's SIG grant with respect to that school?.....</i>	<i>37</i>
I-12.	<i>If a Tier I or Tier II school does not meet the annual student achievement goals established by the LEA, may an SEA renew the LEA's SIG grant with respect to that school? .....</i>	<i>37</i>
I-13.	<i>May an SEA renew an LEA's SIG grant even if the SEA determines that one or more of its schools do not warrant renewed funding?.....</i>	<i>37</i>
I-14.	<i>Will an SEA be obligated to run another SIG competition for grants funded with FY 2010 funds (assuming the availability of appropriations)? .....</i>	<i>37</i>
I-15.	<i>How must an SEA identify its Tier I and Tier II schools for purposes of any competition for SIG funds subsequent to the competition for FY 2009 funds? .....</i>	<i>37</i>
I-16.	<i>How can an SEA support its LEAs and schools with their implementation of the school intervention models discussed in the final requirements?.....</i>	<i>38</i>
I-17.	<i>How do the final requirements for the SIG program impact an SEA that is participating in the Department's "differentiated accountability" pilot?.....</i>	<i>38</i>
I-18.	<i>In the absence of a waiver, when will the period of availability for FY 2009 SIG funds expire?.....</i>	<i>38</i>
<b>J.</b>	<b>SIG, RACE TO THE TOP, AND THE STATE FISCAL STABILIZATION FUND ....</b>	<b>38</b>
J-1.	<i>How can a State design its Race to the Top and SIG plans to work in concert with one another? .....</i>	<i>38</i>
J-2.	<i>What has the Department done to support coordination across SIG, Race to the Top, and the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund program (SFSF)? .....</i>	<i>39</i>
<b>K.</b>	<b>REPORTING METRICS .....</b>	<b>39</b>
K-1.	<i>May an SEA add to the list of leading indicators in the final requirements? .....</i>	<i>39</i>
K-2.	<i>Which of the reporting metrics are new for the SIG program and must be annually reported by an SEA receiving a SIG grant? .....</i>	<i>39</i>
K-3.	<i>For which schools must an SEA report on the metrics that are new for the SIG program?.....</i>	<i>40</i>
K-4.	<i>For which metrics must an SEA report "baseline data" for the school year prior to the implementation of one of the four interventions? .....</i>	<i>40</i>
K-5.	<i>How frequently must an SEA report on the SIG metrics?.....</i>	<i>40</i>
K-6.	<i>Will the Department provide other guidance about the process for submitting and the substance to be included in the required reports? .....</i>	<i>40</i>



**School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the  
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965**

**PURPOSE OF THIS GUIDANCE**

The School Improvement Grants (SIG) program is authorized by section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). Under section 1003(g)(1) of the ESEA, the Secretary must “award grants to States to enable the States to provide subgrants to local educational agencies for the purpose of providing assistance for school improvement consistent with section 1116.” From a grant received pursuant to that provision, a State educational agency (SEA) must subgrant at least 95 percent of the funds it receives to its local educational agencies (LEAs) for school improvement activities. In awarding such subgrants, an SEA must “give priority to the local educational agencies with the lowest-achieving schools that demonstrate — (A) the greatest need for such funds; and (B) the strongest commitment to ensuring that such funds are used to provide adequate resources to enable the lowest-achieving schools to meet the goals under school and local educational improvement, corrective action, and restructuring plans under section 1116.” The regulatory requirements expand upon these provisions, further defining LEAs with the “greatest need” for SIG funds and the “strongest commitment” to ensuring that such funds are used to raise substantially student achievement in the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State.

The purpose of this document is to provide assistance to SEAs, LEAs, and schools in implementing the final requirements for the SIG program, set forth in 74 FR 65618 (Dec. 10, 2009). The Department may supplement this document with additional guidance regarding other elements of the SIG final requirements not addressed in this December 18, 2009 version that may be affected by provisions in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010 regarding SIG funds.

This guidance does not impose any requirements beyond those required to comply with applicable law or regulations. It does not create or confer any rights for or on any person. If you are interested in commenting on this guidance, please e-mail us your comments at [OESEGuidanceDocument@ed.gov](mailto:OESEGuidanceDocument@ed.gov) or write to us at the following address:

U.S. Department of Education  
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education  
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20202

## **A. DEFINITIONS**

### **“Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools” (Tier I and Tier II Schools)**

#### **A-1. What is the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools”?**

“Persistently lowest-achieving schools” means, as determined by the State:

- (a) Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that —
  - (i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring or the lowest-achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, whichever number of schools is greater; or
  - (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years;
- and
- (b) Any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that —
  - (i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of secondary schools or the lowest-achieving five secondary schools in the State that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, whichever number of schools is greater; or
  - (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years.

A school that falls within the definition of (a) above is a “Tier I” school and a school that falls within the definition of (b) above is a “Tier II” school for purposes of using SIG funds under section 1003(g) of the ESEA.

#### **A-2. Does a Title I high school need to meet both the requirements in paragraphs (a)(i) and (a)(ii) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” set forth in A-1 to be identified?**

No. In fact, the requirements in paragraphs (a)(i) and (a)(ii) of the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” are mutually exclusive. In other words, paragraph (a)(ii) is intended to capture those Title I high schools that have a graduation rate that is less than 60 percent over a number of years that are not among the lowest-achieving Title I schools in the State in terms of the academic achievement of their students. As a result, in identifying the State’s persistently lowest-achieving Title I schools, an SEA would first determine its lowest-achieving five percent of such schools, or lowest-achieving five schools, and then add to that list any Title I high schools that have a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years. (See A-11 and A-17, Steps 10-11.) An SEA would apply a similar analysis to secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds. (See A-17, Steps 15-16.)

**A-3. What factors must an SEA consider to identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State?**

To identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State, an SEA must take into account both—

- (a) The academic achievement of the “all students” group in a school in terms of proficiency on the State’s assessments under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA in reading/language arts and mathematics combined; and
- (b) The school’s lack of progress on those assessments over a number of years in the “all students” group.

**A-4. For purposes of identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State, what assessments does an SEA use to determine academic achievement and lack of progress?**

An SEA must use the State’s assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics required under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA. This includes the State’s general assessments, alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, and, if it has them, alternate assessments based on modified academic achievement standards in those subjects.

**A-5. For purposes of identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools in a State, what is the “all students” group?**

The “all students” group is those students who take the State’s assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics required under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA—*i.e.*, students in grades 3 through 8 and high school. The “all students” group includes limited English proficient (LEP) students and students with disabilities, including students with disabilities who take an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards or modified academic achievement standards.

**A-6. For purposes of identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools in a State, which students does an SEA include to determine the percentage of students who are proficient in a school?**

For purposes of identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State, an SEA may use the assessment results of all tested students in the “all students” group or the SEA may use only assessment results of tested students in the “all students” group who were enrolled in the same school for a “full academic year” as that term is defined in the State’s Accountability Workbook under ESEA section 1111.

**A-7. In determining proficiency of the “all students” group, does an SEA include students who are above proficient?**

Yes. Proficiency includes any student who is proficient or above proficient. With respect to students with disabilities who take an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards or modified academic achievement standards, an SEA would include all students who score proficient on those assessments; the caps that apply to counting proficient scores on alternate assessments for purposes of adequate yearly progress determinations do not apply to the

determination of proficiency of the “all students” group for purposes of identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools.

**A-8. For purposes of identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools in a State, what is a secondary school?**

A secondary school is a school that provides “secondary education, as determined under State law, except that the term does not include any education beyond grade 12.” ESEA section 9101(38). Thus, whether a school is a secondary school is dependent on how State law defines secondary education. Depending on State law, a secondary school most certainly would be any high school or K-12 school and might include a middle school or a K-8 school if grades 6 through 8 are part of secondary education under State law. An SEA may use whatever definition of secondary school it normally uses consistent with its State law.

**A-9. For purposes of identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools in a State, what does it mean to be a secondary school “that is eligible for” Title I funds?**

A secondary school is “eligible” to receive Title I funds if it is eligible to receive such funds under section 1113(a) or 1113(b) of the ESEA. In other words, a secondary school can be eligible if its poverty percentage is above the district-wide poverty average, above the appropriate grade-span poverty average, or 35 percent or more. An SEA would most likely use an LEA’s ranking of its schools, by poverty, set forth in the LEA’s Title I, Part A plan to determine which secondary schools are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds.

**A-10. As used in the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools,” how many years make up a “number of years”?**

An SEA has discretion in determining how it will define a “number of years.” An SEA may use as few as two. Moreover, an SEA need not define a “number of years” the same for purposes of determining whether a high school has had a graduation rate of less than 60 percent over “a number of years” as it does for purposes of considering a school’s lack of progress on the State’s assessments over “a number of years.”

**A-11. From among which sets of schools must an SEA identify the lowest-achieving five percent or the lowest-achieving five schools?**

To identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State, an SEA must select two sets of schools—(a) Title I schools at any grade level that are in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring as defined in section 1116 of the ESEA; and (b) secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds—and identify the lowest-achieving five percent or lowest-achieving five schools in each set, whichever is greater. For example, if a State has 2000 schools, including 400 Title I schools, 200 of which are in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, an SEA would identify the persistently lowest-achieving five percent of those 200 Title I schools—*i.e.*, the persistently lowest-achieving ten Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. Similarly, if a State has 1000 schools, including 100 Title I schools, 50 of which are in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, an SEA would identify the persistently lowest-achieving five schools of those 50 Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

(because five is greater than five percent of 50 schools). An SEA would do the same for the set of secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds.

Note that, in addition to the lowest-achieving five percent of schools (or lowest-achieving five schools) identified in this manner, an SEA must identify as persistently lowest-achieving schools any high schools in each set of schools that are not captured on the basis of academic achievement but that have had a graduation rate of less than 60 percent over a number of years.

**A-12. May an SEA weight differently the two factors it must consider in identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools (*i.e.*, academic achievement of the “all students” group and lack of progress on the State’s assessments)?**

An SEA has discretion to determine the weight it gives to these two factors in identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools. For example, an SEA might weight them 50-50 or it might weight achievement or lack of progress more heavily. The goal is for the SEA to identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State based on proficiency in reading/language arts and mathematics and lack of progress in order to best represent the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State that will benefit most from the rigorous interventions required for those schools.

**A-13. In ranking its schools on the basis of each school’s academic achievement results of the “all students” group and lack of progress on the State’s assessments for purposes of identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State, may an SEA give different weight to its secondary schools and its elementary schools?**

An SEA has discretion to determine the proper weight to give to the academic achievement or lack of progress of secondary schools and elementary schools. The goal is for the SEA to identify, on a fair and objective basis, the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State. If the SEA believes that there are factors that contribute to a particular category of schools—*e.g.*, secondary schools—ranking lower than the SEA believes is warranted, perhaps because it is more difficult to show progress or to demonstrate proficiency at the secondary level, the SEA may take these factors into consideration in assigning weight to secondary schools. The SEA, however, should be able to justify any differential weights it assigns.

**A-14. May an SEA take into account other factors in addition to those that it must consider in identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools?**

No. For example, an SEA may not also consider attendance rates or retention rates.

**A-15. How can an SEA determine academic achievement in terms of proficiency of the “all students” group on the State’s reading/language arts and mathematics assessments combined to develop one list of schools that will enable it to identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State?**

To determine the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State in terms of academic achievement, an SEA must rank each set of schools—*i.e.*, Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring and secondary schools eligible for, but that do not receive, Title I funds—from highest to lowest in terms of proficiency of the “all students” group on the State’s reading/language arts and mathematics assessments combined. Accordingly, the SEA must have a

way to combine different proficiency rates between reading/language arts and mathematics for each school. There are likely a number of ways an SEA may do this. Below, we give two examples.

### **EXAMPLE 1**

#### **Single Percentage Method**

##### **Numerator:**

Step 1: Calculate the total number of proficient students in the “all students” group in reading/language arts by adding the number of proficient students in each grade tested in a school. Calculate the total number of proficient students in the “all students” group in mathematics by adding the number of proficient students in each grade tested in the school.

Step 2: Add the total number of proficient students in reading/language arts and mathematics.

##### **Denominator:**

Step 3: Calculate the total number of students in the “all students” group in the school who took the State’s reading/language arts assessment and the total number of students in the “all students” group who took the State’s mathematics assessment.

Step 4: Add the total number of students in the “all students” group in the school who took the State’s reading/language arts assessment and the total number of students in the “all students” group who took the State’s mathematics assessment.

Note: In counting the total number of students who are proficient and the total number of students assessed, include the number of proficient students with disabilities who took an alternate assessment (based on alternate academic achievement standards or modified academic achievement standards) and the total number of students with disabilities who took an alternate assessment.

Step 5: Divide the numerator by the denominator to determine the percent proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics in the school.

Step 6: Rank the schools in each relevant set of schools from highest to lowest using the percentages in Step 5.

### **EXAMPLE 2**

#### **Adding Ranks Method**

- Step 1: Calculate the percent proficient for reading/language arts for every school in the relevant set of schools using the most recent assessment data available. (Use the same data that the State reports on its report card under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the ESEA for the “all students” group.)
- Step 2: Calculate the percent proficient for mathematics for every school in the relevant set of schools using the most recent assessment data available. (Use the same data that the State reports on its report card under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the ESEA for the “all students” group.)
- Step 3: Rank order schools based on the percent proficient for reading/language arts from the highest percent proficient to the lowest percent proficient. The highest percent proficient would receive a rank of one.
- Step 4: Rank order schools based on the percent proficient for mathematics from the highest percent proficient to the lowest percent proficient. The highest percent proficient would receive a rank of one.
- Step 5: Add the numerical ranks for reading/language arts and mathematics for each school.
- Step 6: Rank order schools in each set of schools based on the combined reading/language arts and mathematics ranks for each school. The school with the lowest combined rank (e.g., 2, based on a rank of 1 for both reading/language arts and mathematics) would be the highest-achieving school within the set of schools and the school with the highest combined rate would be the lowest-achieving school within the set of schools.

**A-16. For purposes of identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools, how can an SEA determine whether a school has demonstrated a “lack of progress over a number of years” on the State’s assessments?**

An SEA has discretion in how it determines whether a school has demonstrated a “lack of progress” on the State’s assessments. Below are three examples of how an SEA can determine “lack of progress.” An SEA may use other reasonable approaches.

#### **EXAMPLE 1**

##### **Lowest Achieving Over Multiple Years**

An SEA repeats the steps in Example 1 or Example 2 in A-15 for two previous years for each school. Then, it selects the five percent of schools with the lowest combined percent proficient or highest numerical rank based on three years of data to define the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State.

This same methodology could also be applied using other numbers of years (e.g.,

two out of the last three years; three out of the last four years, etc.).

#### **EXAMPLE 2**

##### **Lack of Specific Progress**

An SEA establishes an amount of progress below which a school would be deemed to be demonstrating a “lack of progress.” For example, an SEA might determine that a school has demonstrated a lack of progress on the State’s assessments if its number of non-proficient students in the “all students” group in reading/language arts and mathematics combined has not decreased by at least 10 percent over the previous two (or three) years. The SEA would apply this standard to each school in its ranking in A-15 until the SEA had identified the lowest-achieving five percent or lowest-achieving five schools in the State in each relevant set of schools. Under this example, there are only two options: a school makes progress, as defined by the SEA, or the school does not.

#### **EXAMPLE 3**

##### **Lack of Relative Progress**

An SEA repeats the steps in Example 1 in A-15 for the previous year (or other number of previous years, as the SEA determines appropriate) for each school in each set of schools and compares the results to the ranking obtained for the most recent year to obtain the difference, which determines the school’s progress, or lack thereof. The SEA ranks those differences from highest to lowest. It then determines the lowest-achieving five percent or lowest-achieving five schools based on the combination of their percent proficient as well as their relative lack of progress. Under this example, two schools with similar proficiency percentages in the most recent year could rank differently depending on their relative amount of progress.

**A-17. What is the complete sequence of steps an SEA should use to develop its final list of the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State?**

The precise sequence of steps an SEA should use to develop its final list of persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State may depend on the methods it is using for combining proficiency rates in reading/language arts and mathematics and for determining lack of progress. In general, however, an SEA should follow these steps:



- Step 1: Determine all relevant definitions—*i.e.*, the definition of “secondary school,” the definition of a “number of years” for purposes of determining whether a high school has a graduation rate less than 60 percent, and the definition of a “number of years” for purposes of determining “lack of progress” on the State’s assessments.
- Step 2: Determine the number of schools that make up five percent of schools in each of the relevant sets of schools (*i.e.*, five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring and five percent of the secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds); determine whether that number or the number five should be used to determine the lowest-achieving schools in each relevant set of schools, depending on which number is larger.
- Step 3: Determine the method for calculating combined English/language arts and mathematics proficiency rates for each school (see A-15).
- Step 4: Determine the method for determining “lack of progress” by the “all students” group on the State’s assessments (see A-16).
- Step 5: Determine the weights to be assigned to academic achievement of the “all students” group and lack of progress on the State’s assessments (see A-12).
- Step 6: Determine the weights to be assigned to elementary schools and secondary schools (see A-13).
- Step 7: Using the process identified in Step 3, rank the Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring from highest to lowest based on the academic achievement of the “all students” group.
- Step 8: Using the process identified in Step 4, as well as the relevant weights identified in steps 5 and 6, apply the second factor—lack of progress—to the list identified in Step 7.
- Step 9: After applying lack of progress, start with the school at the bottom of the list and count up to the relevant number determined in Step 2 to obtain the list of the lowest-achieving five percent (or five) Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
- Step 10: Identify the Title I high schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that have had a graduation rate of less than 60 percent over a number of years (as defined in Step 1) that were not captured in the list of schools identified in Step 9.
- Step 11: Add the high schools identified in Step 10 to the list of schools identified in Step 9.
- Step 12: Using the process identified in Step 3, rank the secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds from highest to lowest based on the academic achievement of the “all students” group.
- Step 13: Using the process identified in Step 4, as well as the relevant weights identified in steps 5 and 6, apply the second factor—lack of progress—to the list identified in Step 12.

Step 14: After applying lack of progress, start with the school at the bottom of the list and count up to the relevant number determined in Step 2 to obtain the list of the lowest-achieving five percent (or five) secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds.

Step 15: Identify the high schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds and that have had a graduation rate of less than 60 percent over a number of years (as defined in Step 1) that were not captured in the list of schools identified in Step 14.

Step 16: Add the high schools identified in Step 15 to the list of schools identified in Step 14.

As exemplified in the table below, together, the two lists of schools resulting from Steps 11 and 16 make up the State's persistently lowest-achieving schools. The list of schools resulting from Step 11 will constitute the Tier I schools and the list of schools resulting from Step 16 will constitute the Tier II schools for purposes of using SIG funds under section 1003(g) of the ESEA. All Title I participating schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not on the list resulting from Step 11 will constitute Tier III schools for purposes of using SIG funds under section 1003(g) of the ESEA.

<u>List Resulting from Step 11 (Tier I)</u>	<u>List Resulting from Step 16 (Tier II)</u>
<p>Lowest-achieving five percent (or five) of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, obtained by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ranking the Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring from highest to lowest based on the academic achievement of the "all students" group;</li> <li>• Applying lack of progress to the rank order list; and</li> <li>• Counting up from the bottom of the list.</li> </ul> <p>Plus</p> <p>Title I high schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that have had a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years (to the extent not already included).</p>	<p>Lowest-achieving five percent (or five) of secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, obtained by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ranking the secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds from highest to lowest based on the academic achievement of the "all students" group;</li> <li>• Applying lack of progress to the rank order list; and</li> <li>• Counting up from the bottom of the list.</li> </ul> <p>Plus</p> <p>High schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds and that have had a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years (to the extent not already included).</p>

### Increased Learning Time

A-18. What is the definition of "increased learning time"?

“Increased learning time” means using a longer school day, week, or year schedule to significantly increase the total number of school hours to include additional time for (a) instruction in core academic subjects including English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography; (b) instruction in other subjects and enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education, including, for example, physical education, service learning, and experiential and work-based learning opportunities that are provided by partnering, as appropriate, with other organizations; and (c) teachers to collaborate, plan, and engage in professional development within and across grades and subjects.

**A-19. Does the definition of “increased learning time” include before- or after-school instructional programs?**

Research supports the effectiveness of well-designed programs that expand learning time by a minimum of 300 hours per school year. (See Frazier, Julie A.; Morrison, Frederick J. “The Influence of Extended-year Schooling on Growth of Achievement and Perceived Competence in Early Elementary School.” *Child Development*. Vol. 69 (2), April 1998, pp.495-497 and research done by Mass2020.) Extending learning into before- and after-school hours can be difficult to implement effectively, but is permissible under this definition, although the Department encourages LEAs to closely integrate and coordinate academic work between in school and out of school. To satisfy the requirements in Section I.A.2(a)(1)(viii) of the turnaround model and Section I.A.2(d)(3)(i)(A) of the transformation model for providing increased learning time, a before- or after-school instructional program must be available to all students in the school.

**Student growth**

**A-20. What is the definition of “student growth”?**

“Student growth” means the change in achievement for an individual student between two or more points in time. For grades in which the State administers summative assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics, student growth data must be based on a student’s score on the State’s assessment under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA. A State may also include other measures that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

**A-21. Why is it necessary to define “student growth” for purposes of SIG grants?**

In Section I.A.2(d)(1)(i)(B)(1) of the transformation model, an LEA must use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that take into account data on student growth as a significant factor. Those systems must also take into account other factors such as multiple observation-based assessments of performance and ongoing collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement and increased high school graduation rates.

**A-22. Do provisions related to SIG funds in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010 affect the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” or the school intervention models?**

No. The definition of “persistently lowest-achieving schools” and the school intervention models in the December 10, 2009 SIG final requirements will not change.

## **B. TURNAROUND MODEL**

### **B-1. What are the required elements of a turnaround model?**

A turnaround model is one in which an LEA must do the following:

- (1) Replace the principal and grant the principal sufficient operational flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach in order to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates;
- (2) Using locally adopted competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment to meet the needs of students,
  - (A) Screen all existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent; and
  - (B) Select new staff;
- (3) Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school;
- (4) Provide staff ongoing, high-quality job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure that they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies;
- (5) Adopt a new governance structure, which may include, but is not limited to, requiring the school to report to a new "turnaround office" in the LEA or SEA, hire a "turnaround leader" who reports directly to the Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer, or enter into a multi-year contract with the LEA or SEA to obtain added flexibility in exchange for greater accountability;
- (6) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards;
- (7) Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students;
- (8) Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time; and
- (9) Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.

### **B-2. In addition to the required elements, what optional elements may also be a part of a turnaround model?**

In addition to the required elements, an LEA implementing a turnaround model may also implement other strategies, such as a new school model or any of the required and permissible activities under the transformation intervention model described in the final requirements. It could also, for example, replace a comprehensive high school with one that focuses on science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM). The key is that these actions would be taken within the framework of the turnaround model and would be in addition to, not instead of, the actions that are required as part of a turnaround model.

**B-3. What is the definition of “staff” as that term is used in the discussion of a turnaround model?**

As used in the discussion of a turnaround model, “staff” includes all instructional staff, but an LEA has discretion to determine whether or not “staff” also includes non-instructional staff. An LEA may decide that it is appropriate to include non-instructional staff in the definition of “staff,” as all members of a school’s staff contribute to the school environment and are important to the success of a turnaround model.

In determining the number of staff members that may be rehired, an LEA should count the total number of staff positions (however staff is defined) within the school in which the model is being implemented, including any positions that may be vacant at the time of the implementation. For example, if a school has a total of 100 staff positions, only 90 of which are filled at the time the model is implemented, the LEA may rehire 50 staff members; the LEA is not limited to rehiring only 45 individuals (50 percent of the filled staff positions).

**B-4. What are “locally adopted competencies”?**

A “competency,” which is a skill or consistent pattern of thinking, feeling, acting, or speaking that causes a person to be effective in a particular job or role, is a key predictor of how someone will perform at work. Given that every teacher brings a unique skill set to the classroom, thoughtfully developed assessments of such competencies can be used as part of a rigorous recruitment, screening, and selection process to identify educators with the unique qualities that equip them to succeed in the turnaround environment and can help ensure a strong match between teachers and particular turnaround schools. As part of a rigorous recruitment, screening and selection process, assessments of turnaround teachers’ competencies can be used by the principal or district leader to distinguish between very high performers and more typical or lower-performing teachers in a turnaround setting. Although an LEA may already have and use a set of tools to screen for appropriate competencies as part of its normal hiring practices, it is important to develop a set of competencies specifically designed to identify staff that can be effective in a turnaround situation because, in a turnaround school, failure has become an entrenched way of life for students and staff, and staff members need stronger and more consistent habits in critical areas to transform the school’s wide-scale failure into learning success.

While each LEA should identify the skills and expertise needed for its local context, in addition to reviewing evidence of effectiveness in previous teaching positions (or other pre-service experience) in the form of recommendations, portfolios, or student outcomes, examples of locally adopted competencies might include acting with initiative and persistence, planning ahead, flexibility, respect for and sensitivity to norms of interaction in different situations, self-confidence, team leadership, developing others, analytical thinking, and conceptual thinking.

The value and utility of turnaround competencies for selection are dependent on the process by which an LEA or school leader or team uses them. In addition to assessing a candidate's subject knowledge and mastery of specific instructional practices that the turnaround school uses, using a robust and multi-tiered selection process that includes interviews that ask about past practice in the classroom or situational scenarios, reviewing writing samples, observing teachers in their classrooms, and asking teachers to perform job-related tasks such as presenting information to a group of parents, are all common techniques used to screen candidates against turnaround competencies.

Note that these are merely examples of a process and set of competencies an LEA might measure and use in screening and selecting staff to meet the unique needs of the schools in which it will implement a turnaround model.

**B-5. Is an LEA implementing the turnaround model required to use financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible conditions as strategies to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a turnaround model?**

No. The specific strategies mentioned in this requirement are merely examples of the types of strategies an LEA might use to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a school implementing the turnaround model. An LEA is not obligated to use these particular strategies, so long as it implements some strategies that are designed to recruit, place, and retain the appropriate staff.

**B-6. What is job-embedded professional development?**

Job-embedded professional development is professional learning that occurs at a school as educators engage in their daily work activities. It is closely connected to what teachers are asked to do in the classroom so that the skills and knowledge gained from such learning can be immediately transferred to classroom instructional practices. Job-embedded professional development is usually characterized by the following:

- It occurs on a regular basis (e.g., daily or weekly);
- It is aligned with academic standards, school curricula, and school improvement goals;
- It involves educators working together collaboratively and is often facilitated by school instructional leaders or school-based professional development coaches or mentors;
- It requires active engagement rather than passive learning by participants; and
- It focuses on understanding what and how students are learning and on how to address students' learning needs, including reviewing student work and achievement data and collaboratively planning, testing, and adjusting instructional strategies, formative assessments, and materials based on such data.

Job-embedded professional development can take many forms, including, but not limited to, classroom coaching, structured common planning time, meetings with mentors, consultation with outside experts, and observations of classroom practice.

When implemented as part of a turnaround model, job-embedded professional development must be designed with school staff.

**B-7. Does the requirement to implement an instructional program that is research-based and aligned (vertically and with State standards) require adoption of a new or revised instructional program?**

Not necessarily. In implementing a turnaround model, an LEA must use data to identify an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned as well as aligned with State academic standards. If an LEA determines, based on a careful review of appropriate data, that the instructional program currently being implemented in a particular school is research-based and properly aligned, it may continue to implement that instructional program. However, the Department expects that most LEAs with Tier I or Tier II schools will need to make at least minor adjustments to the instructional programs in those schools to ensure that those programs are, in fact, research-based and properly aligned.

**B-8. What are examples of social-emotional and community-oriented services that may be supported with SIG funds in a school operating a schoolwide program?**

Social-emotional and community-oriented services that may be offered to students in a school implementing a turnaround model may include health, nutrition, or social services that may be provided in partnership with local service providers, or services such as a family literacy program for parents who need to improve their literacy skills in order to support their children's learning. An LEA should examine the needs of students in the turnaround school to determine which social-emotional and community-oriented services will be appropriate and useful under the circumstances.

**B-9. May an LEA omit any of the actions outlined in the final requirements and implement its own version of a turnaround model?**

No. An LEA implementing a turnaround model in one or more of its schools must take all of the actions required by the final requirements. As discussed in B-2, an LEA may take additional actions to supplement those that are required as part of a turnaround model, but it may not implement its own version of a turnaround model that does not include all of the elements required by the final requirements. Thus, an LEA could not, for example, convert a turnaround school to a magnet school without also taking the other actions specifically required as part of a turnaround model.

## **C. RESTART MODEL**

**C-1. What is the definition of a restart model?**

A restart model is one in which an LEA converts a school or closes and reopens a school under a charter school operator, a charter management organization (CMO), or an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process. A restart model must enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school (see C-6).

**C-2. What is a CMO?**

A CMO is a non-profit organization that operates or manages charter schools by centralizing or sharing certain functions and resources among schools.

**C-3. What is an EMO?**

An EMO is a for-profit or non-profit organization that provides “whole-school operation” services to an LEA.

**C-4. Prior to submitting its application for SIG funds, must an LEA know the particular EMO or CMO with which it would contract to restart a school?**

No. Prior to submitting its application, an LEA need not know the particular EMO or CMO with which it would contract to restart a school, but it should at least have a pool of potential partners that have expressed an interest in and have exhibited an ability to restart the school in which the LEA proposes to implement the restart model. An LEA does not need to enter into a contract prior to receiving its SIG funds, but it must be able to provide enough information in its application for the SEA to be confident that, if awarded SIG funds, the LEA would in fact enter into a contract with a CMO or EMO to implement the restart model.

**C-5. What is the purpose of the “rigorous review process” used for selecting a charter school operator, a CMO, or an EMO?**

The “rigorous review process” permits an LEA to examine a prospective restart operator’s reform plans and strategies. It helps prevent an operator from assuming control of a school without having a meaningful plan for turning it around. The purpose of the rigorous review process is to provide an LEA with an opportunity to ensure that the operator will use this model to make meaningful changes in a school. Through the rigorous review process, an LEA might, for example, require a prospective operator to demonstrate that its strategies are research-based and that it has the capacity to implement the strategies it is proposing.

**C-6. Which students must be permitted to enroll in a school implementing a restart model?**

A restart school must enroll, within the grades it serves, all former students who wish to attend the school. The purpose of this requirement is to ensure that restarting the school benefits the population of students who would be served by the school in the absence of “restarting” the school. Accordingly, the obligation to enroll any former student who wishes to attend the school includes the obligation to enroll a student who did not actually previously attend the school — for example, because the student was previously enrolled in grade 3 but the school serves only grades 4 through 6 — but who would now be able to enroll in the school were it not implementing the restart model. If the restart school no longer serves a particular grade or grades that previously had been served by the school, the restart school is not obligated to enroll a student in the grade or grades that are no longer served.

**C-7. May a restart school serve fewer grades than were previously served by the school in which the model is being implemented?**



Yes. An LEA has flexibility to work with providers to develop the appropriate sequence and timetable for a restart partnership. Thus, for example, an LEA could allow a restart operator to take over one grade in the school at a time.

If an LEA allows a restart operator to serve only some of the grades that were previously served by the school in which the model is being implemented, the LEA must ensure that the SIG funds it receives for the school are used only for the grades being served by the restart operator, unless the LEA is implementing one of the other SIG models with respect to the other grades served by the school. For example, if the school in question previously served grades K-6 and the LEA allows a restart operator to take over the school only with respect to grades K-3, the LEA could use SIG funds to serve the students in grades 4-6 if it implements a turnaround model or school closure, consistent with the final requirements, with respect to those grades.

**C-8. May a school implementing a restart model implement any of the required or permissible activities of a turnaround model or a transformation model?**

Yes. A school implementing a restart model may implement activities described in the final requirements with respect to other models. Indeed, a restart operator has considerable flexibility not only with respect to the school improvement activities it will undertake, but also with respect to the type of school program it will offer. The restart model is specifically intended to give operators flexibility and freedom to implement their own reform plans and strategies.

**C-9. If an LEA implements a restart model, must its contract with the charter school operator, CMO, or EMO hold the charter school operator, CMO, or EMO accountable for meeting the final requirements?**

Yes. If an LEA implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, the LEA must include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter school operator, CMO, or EMO accountable for complying with the final requirements. An LEA should bear this accountability requirement in mind at the time of contracting with the charter school operator, CMO, or EMO, and should consider how best to reflect it in the contract or agreement.

**D. SCHOOL CLOSURE**

**D-1. What is the definition of “school closure”?**

School closure occurs when an LEA closes a school and enrolls the students who attended that school in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving. These other schools should be within reasonable proximity to the closed school and may include, but are not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.

**D-2. What costs associated with closing a school can be paid for with SIG funds?**

An LEA may use SIG funds to pay certain reasonable and necessary costs associated with closing a Tier I or Tier II school, such as costs related to parent and community outreach, including, but not limited to, press releases, newsletters, newspaper announcements, hotlines, direct mail notices, or meetings regarding the school closure; services to help parents and students transition to a new school; or orientation activities, including open houses, that are specifically designed for students

attending a new school after their prior school closes. Other costs, such as revising transportation routes, transporting students to their new school, or making class assignments in a new school, are regular responsibilities an LEA carries out for all students and generally may not be paid for with SIG funds. However, an LEA may use SIG funds to cover these types of costs associated with its general responsibilities if the costs are directly attributable to the school closure and exceed the costs the LEA would have incurred in the absence of the closure.

**D-3. May SIG funds be used in the school that is receiving students who previously attended a school that is subject to closure in order to cover the costs associated with accommodating those students?**

No. In general, the costs a receiving school will incur to accommodate students who are moved from a closed school are costs that an LEA is expected to cover, and may not be paid for with SIG funds. However, to the extent a receiving school is a Title I school that increases its population of children from low-income families, the school should receive additional Title I, Part A funds through the Title I, Part A funding formula, and those Title I, Part A funds could be used to cover the educational costs for these new students. If the school is not currently a Title I school, the addition of children from low-income families from a closed school might make it an eligible school.

**D-4. Is the portion of an LEA's SIG subgrant that is to be used to implement a school closure renewable?**

Generally, no. The portion of an LEA's SIG subgrant for a school that is subject to closure is limited to the time necessary to close the school — usually one year or less. As such, the funds allocated for a school closure would not be subject to renewal.

**D-5. How can an LEA determine whether a higher-achieving school is within reasonable proximity to a closed school?**

The school to which students who previously attended a closed school are sent should be located “within reasonable proximity” to the closed school. An LEA has discretion to determine which schools are located within a reasonable proximity to a closed school. A distance that is considered to be within a “reasonable proximity” in one LEA may not be within a “reasonable proximity” in another LEA, depending on the nature of the community. In making this determination, an LEA should consider whether students who would be required to attend a new school because of a closure would be unduly inconvenienced by having to travel to the new location. An LEA should also consider whether the burden on students could be eased by designating multiple schools as receiving schools.

An LEA should not eliminate school closure as an option simply because the higher-achieving schools that could be receiving schools are located at some distance from the closed school, so long as the distance is not unreasonable. Indeed, it is preferable for an LEA to send students who previously attended a closed school to a higher-achieving school that is located at some distance from, but still within reasonable proximity to, the closed school than to send those students to a lower-performing school that is geographically closer to the closed school. Moreover, an LEA should consider allowing parents to choose from among multiple higher-achieving schools, at least one of which is located within reasonable proximity to the closed school. By providing multiple school options, a parent could decide, for example, that it is worth having his or her child travel a

longer distance in order to attend a higher-achieving school. Ultimately, the LEA's goal should be to ensure that students who previously attended a closed school are able to enroll in the highest-performing school that can reasonably be offered as an alternative to the closed school.

**D-6. In what kinds of schools may students who previously attended a closed school enroll?**

The higher-achieving schools in which students from a closed school may enroll may include any public school with the appropriate grade ranges, including public charter schools and new schools for which achievement data are not yet available. Note that a new school for which achievement data are not yet available may be a receiving school even though, as a new school, it lacks a history of being a "higher-achieving" school.

**E. TRANSFORMATION MODEL**

**E-1. With respect to elements of the transformation model that are the same as elements of the turnaround model, do the definitions and other guidance that apply to those elements as they relate to the turnaround model also apply to those elements as they relate to the transformation model?**

Yes. Thus, for example, the strategies that are used to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of students in a turnaround model may be the same strategies that are used to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of students in a transformation model. For questions about any terms or strategies that appear in both the transformation model and the turnaround model, refer to the turnaround model section of this guidance.

**E-2. Which activities related to developing and increasing teacher and school leader effectiveness are required for an LEA implementing a transformation model?**

An LEA implementing a transformation model must:

- (1) Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model;
- (2) Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that —
  - (a) Take into account data on student growth as a significant factor as well as other factors, such as multiple observation-based assessments of performance and ongoing collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement and increased high school graduation rates; and
  - (b) Are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement;
- (3) Identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so;

- (4) Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies; and
- (5) Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation model.

**E-3. Must the principal and teachers involved in the development and design of the evaluation system be the principal and teachers in the school in which the transformation model is being implemented?**

No. The requirement for teacher and principal evaluation systems that “are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement” refers more generally to involvement by teachers and principals within the LEA using such systems, and may or may not include teachers and principals in a school implementing the transformation model.

**E-4. Under the final requirements, an LEA implementing the transformation model must remove staff “who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so.” Does an LEA have discretion to determine the appropriate number of such opportunities that must be provided and what are some examples of such “opportunities” to improve?**

In general, LEAs have flexibility to determine both the type and number of opportunities for staff to improve their professional practice before they are removed from a school implementing the transformation model. Examples of such opportunities include professional development in such areas as differentiated instruction and using data to improve instruction, mentoring or partnering with a master teacher, or increased time for collaboration designed to improve instruction.

**E-5. In addition to the required activities, what other activities related to developing and increasing teacher and school leader effectiveness may an LEA undertake as part of its implementation of a transformation model?**

In addition to the required activities for a transformation model, an LEA may also implement other strategies to develop teachers' and school leaders' effectiveness, such as:

- (1) Providing additional compensation to attract and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of students in a transformation school;
- (2) Instituting a system for measuring changes in instructional practices resulting from professional development; or
- (3) Ensuring that the school is not required to accept a teacher without the mutual consent of the teacher and principal, regardless of the teacher's seniority.

LEAs also have flexibility to develop and implement their own strategies, as part of their efforts to successfully implement the transformation model, to increase the effectiveness of teachers and

school leaders. Any such strategies must be in addition to those that are required as part of this model.

**E-6. How does the optional activity of “providing additional compensation to attract and retain” certain staff differ from the requirement to implement strategies designed to recruit, place, and retain certain staff?**

There are a wide range of compensation-based incentives that an LEA might use as part of a transformation model. Such incentives are just one example of strategies that might be adopted to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills needed to implement the transformation model. The more specific emphasis on additional compensation in the permissible strategies was intended to encourage LEAs to think more broadly about how additional compensation can contribute to teacher effectiveness.

**E-7. Which activities related to comprehensive instructional reform strategies are required as part of the implementation of a transformation model?**

An LEA implementing a transformation model must:

- (1) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards; and
- (2) Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) in order to inform and differentiate instruction to meet the academic needs of individual students.

**E-8. In addition to the required activities, what other activities related to comprehensive instructional reform strategies may an LEA undertake as part of its implementation of a transformation model?**

In addition to the required activities for a transformation model, an LEA may also implement other comprehensive instructional reform strategies, such as:

- (1) Conducting periodic reviews to ensure that the curriculum is being implemented with fidelity, is having the intended impact on student achievement, and is modified if ineffective;
- (2) Implementing a schoolwide “response-to-intervention” model;
- (3) Providing additional supports and professional development to teachers and principals in order to implement effective strategies to support students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment and to ensure that limited English proficient students acquire language skills to master academic content;
- (4) Using and integrating technology-based supports and interventions as part of the instructional program; and
- (5) In secondary schools—

- (a) Increasing rigor by offering opportunities for students to enroll in advanced coursework, early-college high schools, dual enrollment programs, or thematic learning academies that prepare students for college and careers, including by providing appropriate supports designed to ensure that low-achieving students can take advantage of these programs and coursework;
- (b) Improving student transition from middle to high school through summer transition programs or freshman academies;
- (c) Increasing graduation rates through, for example, credit recovery programs, re-engagement strategies, smaller learning communities, competency-based instruction and performance-based assessments, and acceleration of basic reading and mathematics skills; or
- (d) Establishing early-warning systems to identify students who may be at risk of failing to achieve to high standards or to graduate.

**E-9. What activities related to increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools are required for implementation of a transformation model?**

An LEA implementing a transformation model must:

- (1) Establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time; and
- (2) Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.

**E-10. What is meant by the phrase “family and community engagement” and what are some examples of ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement?**

In general, family and community engagement means strategies to increase the involvement and contributions, in both school-based and home-based settings, of parents and community partners that are designed to support classroom instruction and increase student achievement. Examples of mechanisms that can encourage family and community engagement include the establishment of organized parent groups, holding public meetings involving parents and community members to review school performance and help develop school improvement plans, using surveys to gauge parent and community satisfaction and support for local public schools, implementing complaint procedures for families, coordinating with local social and health service providers to help meet family needs, and parent education classes (including GED, adult literacy, and ESL programs).

**E-11. In addition to the required activities, what other activities related to increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools may an LEA undertake as part of its implementation of a transformation model?**

In addition to the required activities for a transformation model, an LEA may also implement other strategies to extend learning time and create community-oriented schools, such as:

- (1) Partnering with parents and parent organizations, faith- and community-based organizations, health clinics, other State or local agencies, and others to create safe school environments that meet students’ social, emotional, and health needs;

- (2) Extending or restructuring the school day so as to add time for such strategies as advisory periods that build relationships between students, faculty, and other school staff;
- (3) Implementing approaches to improve school climate and discipline, such as implementing a system of positive behavioral supports or taking steps to eliminate bullying and student harassment; or
- (4) Expanding the school program to offer full-day kindergarten or pre-kindergarten.

**E-12. How does the optional activity of extending or restructuring the school day to add time for strategies that build relationships between students, faculty, and other school staff differ from the requirement to provide increased learning time?**

Extra time or opportunities for teachers and other school staff to create and build relationships with students can provide the encouragement and incentive that many students need to work hard and stay in school. Such opportunities may be created through a wide variety of extra-curricular activities as well as structural changes, such as dividing large incoming classes into smaller theme-based teams with individual advisers. However, such activities do not directly lead to increased learning time, which is more closely focused on increasing the number of instructional minutes in the school day or days in the school year.

**E-13. What activities related to providing operational flexibility and sustained support are required for implementation of a transformation model?**

An LEA implementing a transformation model must:

- (1) Give the school sufficient operational flexibility (such as staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates; and
- (2) Ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO).

**E-14. Must an LEA implementing the transformation model in a school give the school operational flexibility in the specific areas of staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting?**

No. The areas of operational flexibility mentioned in this requirement are merely examples of the types of operational flexibility an LEA might give to a school implementing the transformation model. An LEA is not obligated to give a school implementing the transformation model operational flexibility in these particular areas, so long as it provides the school sufficient operational flexibility to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates.

**E-15. In addition to the required activities, what other activities related to providing operational flexibility and sustained support may an LEA undertake as part of its implementation of a transformation model?**

In addition to the required activities for a transformation model, an LEA may also implement other strategies to provide operational flexibility and sustained support, such as:

- (1) Allowing the school to be run under a new governance arrangement, such as a turnaround division within the LEA or SEA; or
- (2) Implementing a per-pupil school-based budget formula that is weighted based on student needs.

## **F. CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES**

### **F-1. How may an LEA implement the turnaround, school closure, restart, or transformation intervention models in a Tier I school operating a targeted assistance program?**

The Secretary is inviting requests for waivers to enable a Tier I school operating a targeted assistance program to operate a schoolwide program so it can implement a turnaround, restart, school closure, or transformation model, each of which impacts the entire educational program of the school in which it is implemented. Such a waiver is necessary because a school operating a targeted assistance program may only provide Title I services to students who are failing, or most at risk of failing, to meet a State's student academic achievement standards; it may not provide Title I services for the school as a whole. To the extent that the percentage of students from low-income families attending a Tier I school operating a targeted assistance program is at or above 40 percent, a waiver is not needed, as the school already meets the statutory poverty threshold for operating a schoolwide program. Further, although the decision to operate a schoolwide program is typically made by the school in consultation with the LEA, an LEA may require a Tier I school to operate a schoolwide program in order to implement one of the intervention models, consistent with the overall goal of the SIG program.

A Tier I school in which an LEA implements a waiver to enable the school to operate a schoolwide program or a Tier I school that is operating a schoolwide program for the first time, but not through the implementation of a waiver (*i.e.*, because it meets the 40 percent poverty threshold), must meet all the programmatic requirements of section 1114 of the ESEA. However, because the provisions of section 1114 and the SIG intervention models are intended to upgrade the instructional program of an entire school, simply by implementing one of the intervention models, an LEA would likely be complying with most, if not all, of the requirements for a schoolwide program. Further, the fact that a school is implementing one of the models is sufficient to enable an LEA to make a determination that a school needs less than a full year to develop its schoolwide plan. Once a school begins implementing a waiver to operate a schoolwide program, it may continue to operate the schoolwide program as long as it so chooses without needing additional waivers.

### **F-2. What is the timeline for implementing an intervention model in a Tier I or Tier II school using FY 2009 funds?**

Consistent with the intent of the ARRA both to infuse funds into the economy and to support significant improvement in our Nation's persistently lowest-achieving schools, the Department expects that the majority of the FY 2009 SIG funds will be used to fully implement intervention models in Tier I and Tier II schools in the 2010–2011 school year. The Department recognizes,



however, that certain model components, such as job-embedded professional development or identifying and rewarding teachers and principals who have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates through effective implementation of a model, will occur later in the process of implementing a model.

**F-3. What requirements that apply to schools receiving Title I, Part A funds apply to schools that receive SIG funds?**

Schools receiving SIG funds under section 1003(g) that also receive funds under Title I, Part A are Title I schools and must comply with all Title I requirements, as applicable. This would include, for example, the requirements in section 1116, including the requirements regarding school improvement plans, except to the extent the LEA implements a waiver enabling Tier I schools implementing a turnaround or restart model to start over in the school improvement timeline.

A non-Title I school that receives SIG funds must comply only with the requirements of section 1003(g), the final requirements, and the conditions of any waiver it implements related to its SIG funds.

**F-4. How do the Title I supplement not supplant requirements apply to SIG funds allocated under section 1003(g) of the ESEA?**

Two provisions in Title I of the ESEA require a school receiving Title I funds to use those funds to supplement, and not supplant, State and local funds that the school would receive in the absence of Title I funds: section 1114(a)(2)(B) and section 1120A(b). As discussed further below, the two provisions operate slightly differently.

Under section 1114(a)(2)(B), if an LEA has a school operating a schoolwide program, the LEA must ensure that, of the non-Federal funds available to the LEA in a given year, the school receives all of those funds it would otherwise have received if it were not operating a schoolwide program, including those funds necessary to provide services required by law for students with disabilities and LEP students. This requirement applies to SIG funds. In other words, an LEA must ensure that a school operating a schoolwide program that receives SIG funds also receives all of the non-Federal funds it would have received if it were not operating a schoolwide program. Note, however, that the school does not need to demonstrate that Title I, Part A funds or SIG funds are used only for activities that supplement those the school would otherwise provide with non-Federal funds. (ESEA section 1114(a)(2)(A)(ii).)

Under section 1120A(b), if an LEA has a school operating a targeted assistance program, the LEA must ensure that the Title I, Part A funds the school receives are used only for activities that supplement those that would be available from non-Federal funds for Title I participating students in the absence of the Title I, Part A funds. In other words, the focus of section 1120A(b) is on ensuring the supplemental nature of the activities funded or services provided with Title I, Part A funds. The supplement not supplant requirement in section 1120A(b) does not apply to SIG funds because they are not funds available under Part A of Title I. As such, an LEA is not obligated to ensure that SIG funds are used in a school operating a targeted assistance program only for activities that supplement those that would be available from non-Federal funds in the absence of the SIG funds. Note, however, that the LEA is obligated to ensure that all of its Title I schools, including

those operating a targeted assistance program, are comparable to non-Title I schools in accordance with section 1120A(c) of the ESEA.

**F-5. What action must an LEA take if it receives SIG funds to implement one of the four models in a particular school and subsequently is unable to implement the model in that school?**

An LEA that receives SIG funds to implement an intervention model in a particular school may subsequently determine that it is unable to implement the model in that school, for example, because it is unable to hire a principal to implement a turnaround model or is unable to contract with a CMO or an EMO to implement a restart model. If that happens, the LEA must amend its application indicating which other model it will implement in that school. In addition, the SEA must post the final amended application on its Web site (see I-5).

**F-6. May an LEA use SIG funds for general district-level improvement activities?**

An LEA may use SIG funds to pay for district-level activities to support implementation one of the four school intervention models in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve and to support other school improvement strategies in the Tier III schools it commits to serve. For example, an LEA might hire a district-level turnaround specialist to establish an “early warning system” designed to identify students in Tier I or Tier II schools who may be at risk of failing to achieve high standards or graduate, or to support implementation of a turnaround model. However, an LEA may not use SIG funds to support district-level activities for schools that are not receiving SIG funds.

**F-7. How can an LEA ensure that it is able to implement fully and effectively all required components of a selected school intervention model, given that some components may be affected by collective bargaining agreements or other contracts?**

Some of the required components of the intervention models may be affected by collective bargaining agreements or other contracts. For example, a collective bargaining agreement may include provisions regarding systems that may be used to evaluate teachers, professional development requirements, or strategies that may be used to retain staff. Because such provisions may impact an LEA’s ability to implement the intervention models, effective implementation is dependent on the close collaboration of LEA and school administrators, teachers, and other partners, as appropriate. The Department encourages such collaboration with respect to all model components. The Department also recognizes that, beyond collaboration, full and effective implementation of a selected model may require negotiation with teachers’ unions. The Department encourages LEAs to involve teachers’ unions early in the process of implementing the final requirements to ensure that the LEA can implement fully and effectively the selected intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve.

In addition to collective bargaining agreements or teacher contracts, other types of agreements may impact an LEA’s ability to implement fully and effectively one or more of the school intervention models. For example, if an LEA contracts with an outside provider to provide certain services that are necessary for full implementation of a model (*e.g.*, a contract to provide community-oriented services and supports as required for the turnaround model or a contract to provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement as required by the transformation model), that contract will likely impact how the model is implemented. Although an LEA may outsource the

implementation of some components of a selected intervention model in this manner, ultimately, the LEA is responsible for ensuring that the model is implemented fully and effectively. Accordingly, the LEA should include in any contracts with outside providers terms or provisions that will enable the LEA to ensure full and effective implementation of the model.

**F-8. What are an SEA's responsibilities for ensuring proper implementation of SIG grants?**

As with any Federal education program administered through a State, an SEA is responsible for ensuring that SIG funds are awarded to LEAs and are used by LEAs in accordance with the statutory requirements and the SIG final requirements. In other words, an SEA must ensure that SIG funds it awards to an LEA are used to implement one of the four school intervention models in each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA commits to serve and to carry out school improvement activities in the Tier III schools the LEA commits to serve. Fulfilling this responsibility includes designing an LEA application, carrying out the application review process, and monitoring implementation.

An SEA may, consistent with section 1903 of the ESEA, issue rules and regulations or adopt policies that support and facilitate implementation of SIG grants.

**F-9. May an SEA require an LEA to adopt a particular model for a particular school?**

No. Each LEA has the discretion to determine which model to implement for each school it elects to serve with SIG funds. The only exception to this is if, consistent with State law, the SEA takes over the LEA or school.

**F-10. Is an SEA or LEA that receives SIG funds required to comply with applicable Federal civil rights laws?**

Yes. An SEA or LEA that receives SIG funds is required to comply with Federal civil rights laws that prohibit discrimination based on race, color, national origin, sex, disability, and age. For information on applicable civil rights laws, see the Notice on Civil Rights Obligations Applicable to the Distribution of Funds under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/gen/leg/recovery/notices/civil-rights.html>).

**G. PROVIDING FLEXIBILITY**

**G-1. May an SEA award SIG funds to an LEA for a Tier I or Tier II school that has implemented, in whole or in part, a turnaround model, restart model, or transformation model within the last two years?**

Yes, Section I.B.1. of the final requirements allows an SEA to award SIG funds to an LEA for a Tier I or Tier II school that has implemented, in whole or in part, one of the models within the last two years so that the LEA and school can continue or complete the intervention being implemented. For example, if a Tier I or Tier II school has replaced its principal within the last two years, the SEA may award funds to the school's LEA to implement a turnaround model in the school even though the school will not be required to hire another new principal. A school that receives SIG funds in accordance with this flexibility must fully implement the selected model as required by the final

requirements. In other words, if the school had been implementing the model only in part, it must use the funds it receives to expand its implementation so that it fully complies with the regulatory requirements.

**G-2. May an SEA award SIG funds to an LEA for a Tier III school that has implemented, in whole or in part, a turnaround model, restart model, or transformation model within the last two years so that the LEA and school can continue or complete their implementation of the model?**

Yes, SIG funds may be awarded to an LEA for a Tier III school to continue or complete its implementation of a turnaround, restart, or transformation model. However, the fact that a Tier III school would use its SIG funds to continue or complete its implementation of one of these models would not permit an SEA to prioritize an LEA funding a school in this manner over LEAs that will implement one of the models in a Tier I or Tier II school. In other words, although this is a permissible use of funds in a Tier III school, it does not provide a basis for altering the priority requirements set forth in the final requirements.

**G-3. What would the new improvement timeline be for a school implementing a school improvement timeline waiver of section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA?**

A school implementing a school improvement timeline waiver of section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA would begin the improvement timeline anew beginning the first year in which the improvement model is being implemented. For example, with respect to SIG grants made using FY 2009 funds for implementation in the 2010–2011 school year, the school would start the improvement timeline over beginning with the 2010–2011 school year. That means the earliest such a school could enter the first year of improvement under section 1116(b) of the ESEA would be the beginning of the 2012–2013 school year (*i.e.*, based on the failure to make AYP based on assessments administered in the 2010–2011 and 2011–2012 school years).

**G-4. How does an SEA's receipt of a waiver of section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) to extend the period of availability of SIG funds affect an LEA seeking SIG funds?**

If an SEA receives a waiver of section 421(b) of GEPA to extend the period of availability of SIG funds, that waiver automatically applies to every LEA in the State seeking SIG funds. Accordingly, if an SEA is granted this waiver, an LEA must create a budget for the full period of availability of the funds, including the period granted by the waiver.

**G-5. If an SEA receives a waiver of section 421(b) of GEPA to extend the period of availability of SIG funds, for how long will the funds be available?**

An SEA that requests a waiver of section 421(b) of GEPA to extend the period of availability of SIG funds may seek to make the funds available for up to two years beyond the regular period of availability. For example, without a waiver, FY 2009 SIG funds will be available until September 30, 2011. Through a waiver, those funds could be made available for up to two additional years — until September 30, 2013.

**G-6. What is the process for an SEA to apply for the waivers discussed in the final requirements?**

The SEA application for SIG funds includes a section for an SEA to indicate which of the waivers it is requesting.

**G-7. What is the process for an LEA to request approval to implement a SIG-related waiver granted to an SEA?**

As noted above (see G-4), if a waiver of section 421(b) of GEPA to extend the period of availability of SIG funds is granted to an SEA, it will apply automatically to each LEA in the State that receives SIG funds.

An LEA may implement other SIG-related waivers granted to its SEA simply by indicating on its application for SIG funds that, if awarded the funds, it would implement the waiver. If an SEA requests and receives one or more waivers, the LEA application the SEA develops must include a section for an LEA to indicate which of these waivers the LEA would implement if awarded SIG funds. That section of the LEA application must require the LEA to indicate the schools for which it will implement the waiver if the LEA does not intend to implement the waiver with respect to each applicable school.

**G-8. Prior to applying for one or more of the waivers discussed in the final requirements through the submission of its application for SIG funds, must an SEA comply with the notice-and-comment requirements in section 9401 of the ESEA?**

Yes. In particular, the SEA must provide all interested LEAs in the State with notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment on the request (ESEA section 9401(b)(3)(A)(i)). The SEA must submit all comments it receives from those LEAs to the Secretary along with its application for SIG funds (ESEA section 9401(b)(3)(A)(ii)). The SEA must also provide notice and information regarding the waiver request to the public in the manner in which the SEA customarily provides such notice and information to the public (ESEA section 9401(b)(3)(A)(iii)), such as through a public Web site.

**G-9. Must an SEA seek any of the waivers discussed in the final requirements?**

No. An SEA is never obligated to request a waiver of statutory or regulatory requirements.

**G-10. If an SEA does not seek one or more of the waivers discussed in the final requirements, may an LEA seek those waivers directly from the Department?**

Yes. If one of the waivers discussed in the final requirements is granted directly to an LEA because the SEA chose not to apply for the waiver, the SEA must honor the waiver and any priorities or obligations attendant to it. Thus, for example, if a particular LEA receives a waiver to extend the period of availability of the SIG funds, the SEA must allocate funds to that LEA for the full period of availability taking into account the waiver granted to the LEA. The SEA must develop a mechanism for keeping track of the waivers related to the use of SIG funds granted directly to an LEA by the Department, whether through the LEA application for SIG funds or otherwise.

## **H. LEA REQUIREMENTS**

**H-1. Must an LEA that previously submitted an approved SIG application that is eligible for renewal submit a new application for FY 2009 funds?**

Yes. Any LEA seeking SIG funds appropriated for FY 2009 or any subsequent year must submit a new application that meets the final requirements. Accordingly, the timeline for renewal will start anew with the approval of an LEA's application for FY 2009 funds (*i.e.*, the 2010–2011 school year will be the first year of the grant, which may be renewed for the 2011–2012 and 2012–2013 school years).

**H-2. What must an LEA include in its application to the SEA for SIG funds?**

In addition to any other information that the SEA may require, the LEA must:

- (1) Identify the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools the LEA commits to serve;
- (2) Identify the school intervention model the LEA will implement in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve;
- (3) For each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve, demonstrate that the LEA--
  - Has analyzed the needs of each school and selected an intervention for each school.
  - Has the capacity to enable each school to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected;
- (4) If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school, explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school;
- (5) Describe actions it has taken, or will take, to:
  - Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements;
  - Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;
  - Align other resources with the interventions;
  - Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and
  - Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends;
- (6) Include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application;
- (7) Describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it has established in order to monitor its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive SIG funds;
- (8) For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement;
- (9) Include a budget indicating the amount of SIG funds the LEA will use to--

- a. Implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve;
  - b. Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA's Tier I and Tier II schools; and
  - c. Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA's application;
- (10) Consult with relevant stakeholders, as appropriate, regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools;
- (11) Include the required assurances; and
- (12) Indicate any waivers that the LEA will implement with respect to its SIG funds.

**H-3. Must an LEA identify every Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school located within the LEA in its application for SIG funds?**

No, an LEA need not identify every Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school located within the LEA in its application; the LEA need only identify the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools that it commits to serve with SIG funds.

**H-4. If an LEA wishes to serve a Tier III school, must it provide SIG funds directly to the school?**

No. An LEA may "serve" a Tier III school by providing services that provide a direct benefit to the school. Accordingly, a Tier III school that an LEA commits to serve must receive some tangible benefit from the LEA's use of SIG funds, the value of which can be determined by the LEA, but the school need not actually receive SIG funds. For example, an LEA might use a portion of its SIG funds at the district level to hire an outside expert to help Tier III schools examine their achievement data and determine what school improvement activities to provide based on that data analysis. Similarly, an LEA might provide professional development at the district level to all or a subset of its Tier III schools.

**H-5. Are there any particular school improvement strategies that an LEA must implement in its Tier III schools?**

No. An LEA has flexibility to choose the strategies it will implement in the Tier III schools it commits to serve. Of course, the strategies the LEA selects should be research-based and designed to address the particular needs of the Tier III schools.

**H-6. May an LEA use SIG funds to continue to implement school improvement strategies that do not meet the requirements of one of the four models but that have helped improve achievement in the LEA?**

Yes. An LEA may use SIG funds for these activities in Tier III schools or may add them to the school intervention models in Tier I or Tier II schools, to the extent they are consistent with the requirements of those models. The LEA may also use other sources of funds, such as school

improvement funds it receives under section 1003(a) of the ESEA or under Title I, Part A, for these other strategies.

**H-7. May an LEA implement several of the school intervention models among the Tier I and Tier II schools it commits to serve?**

Generally, yes. An LEA may use whatever mix of school intervention models it determines is appropriate. However, if an LEA has nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools, the LEA may not implement the transformation model in more than 50 percent of those schools (see H-11).

**H-8. How can an LEA demonstrate that it has the capacity to use SIG funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve in order to implement fully and effectively one of the four school intervention models?**

An LEA can demonstrate that it has the capacity to use SIG funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve by addressing a number of matters. For example, the LEA might emphasize the credentials of staff who have the capability to implement one of the school intervention models. The LEA might also indicate its ability to recruit new principals to implement the turnaround and transformation models or the availability of CMOs and EMOs it could enlist to implement the restart model. The LEA might also indicate the support of its teachers' union with respect to the staffing and teacher evaluation requirements in the turnaround and transformation models, the commitment of its school board to eliminate any barriers and to facilitate full and effective implementation of the models, and the support of staff and parents in schools to be served. In addition, the LEA should indicate through the timeline required in its application that it has the ability to get the basic elements of its selected models up and running by the beginning of the 2010–2011 school year.

**H-9. How can an LEA use “external providers” to turn around its persistently lowest-achieving schools?**

The most specific way an LEA can use “external providers” is to contract with a charter school operator, a CMO, or an EMO to implement the restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school. The LEA might also contract with a turnaround organization to assist it in implementing the turnaround model. The LEA might also use external providers to provide technical expertise in implementing a variety of components of the school intervention models, such as helping a school evaluate its data and determine what changes are needed based on those data; providing job-embedded professional development; designing an equitable teacher and principal evaluation system that relies on student achievement; and creating safe school environments that meet students' social, emotional, and health needs.

**H-10. What are examples of “other resources” an LEA might align with the interventions it commits to implement using SIG funds?**

An LEA might use a number of other resources, in addition to its SIG funds, to implement the school intervention models in the final requirements. For example, an LEA might use school improvement funds it receives under section 1003(a) of the ESEA or Title I, Part A funds it received under the ARRA. The LEA might also use its general Title I, Part A funds as well as funds it



receives under other ESEA authorities, such as Title II, Part A, which it could use for recruiting high-quality teachers, or Title III, Part A, which it could use to improve the English proficiency of LEP students.

**H-11. What is the cap on the number of schools in which an LEA may implement the transformation model and to which LEAs does it apply?**

An LEA with nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools may not implement the transformation model in more than 50 percent of those schools. Given that the cap only applies to an LEA with nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools, an LEA with, for example, four Tier I schools and four Tier II schools, for a total of eight Tier I and Tier II schools, would not be impacted by the cap. However, an LEA with, for example, seven Tier I schools and two Tier II schools, for a total of nine Tier I and Tier II schools, would be impacted by the cap. Thus, continuing the prior example, the LEA with seven Tier I schools and two Tier II schools would be able to implement the transformation model in no more than four of those schools.

**H-12. May an LEA use SIG funds to serve a school that feeds into a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school, but is not itself a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school?**

No. Only a school that is a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school may be served with SIG funds.

**H-13. What criteria must an LEA use to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that receives SIG funds?**

An LEA must monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that receives SIG funds to determine whether the school:

- (1) Is meeting annual goals established by the LEA for student achievement on the State's ESEA assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics; and
- (2) Is making progress on the leading indicators described in the final requirements.

**H-14. What are examples of the annual goals for student achievement that an LEA must establish?**

An LEA must establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's ESEA assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it will use to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that receives SIG funds. Annual goals that an LEA could set might include making at least one year's progress in reading/language arts and mathematics; reducing the percentage of students who are non-proficient on the State's reading/language arts and mathematics assessments by 10 percent or more from the prior year; or meeting the goals the State establishes in its Race to the Top application.

Note that the determination of whether a school meets the goals for student achievement established by the LEA is in addition to the determination of whether the school makes AYP as required by section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA. In other words, each LEA receiving SIG funds must monitor the Tier I and Tier II schools it is serving to determine whether they have met the LEA's annual goals for student achievement and must also comply with its obligations for making accountability determinations under section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA.

**H-15. What are the leading indicators that will be used to hold schools receiving SIG funds accountable?**

The following metrics constitute the leading indicators for the SIG program:

- (1) Number of minutes within the school year;
- (2) Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup;
- (3) Dropout rate;
- (4) Student attendance rate;
- (5) Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes;
- (6) Discipline incidents;
- (7) Truants;
- (8) Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA's teacher evaluation system; and
- (9) Teacher attendance rate.

**I. SEA REQUIREMENTS**

**I-1. What must an SEA do to receive a SIG grant?**

To receive a SIG grant, an SEA must submit an application to the Department at such time, and containing such information, as the Secretary shall reasonably require.

In addition to any other information that the Secretary may reasonably require, an SEA's application for a SIG grant must describe:

- (1) The SEA's process and timeline for approving LEA applications.
- (2) The SEA's process for reviewing an LEA's annual goals for student achievement and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA's SIG grant if one or more schools within the LEA are not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators.
- (3) How the SEA will monitor each LEA that receives a SIG grant to ensure that it is implementing a school intervention model fully and effectively in the Tier I and Tier II schools identified in the LEA's application.
- (4) How the SEA will prioritize SIG grants to LEAs if the SEA does not have sufficient SIG funds to serve all eligible schools for which each LEA applies.

- (5) The SEA's criteria, if any, that it will use to determine whether an LEA needs less than \$500,000 for a Tier I or Tier II school that is implementing a turnaround, restart, or transformation model.
- (6) The criteria, if any, that the SEA intends to use to prioritize among Tier III schools.
- (7) If the SEA intends to take over any Tier I or Tier II schools, identify those schools and indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school.
- (8) If the SEA intends to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, identify those schools and, for Tier I or Tier II schools, indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school, and provide evidence of the LEA's approval to have the SEA provide the services directly.

The SEA's application must also provide the criteria it will use to evaluate an LEA's application (see I-2), as well as certain assurances related to its SIG grant.

**I-2. Before approving an LEA's application, what factors must an SEA consider to determine whether the application meets the final requirements?**

An SEA must have criteria to evaluate the following information in an LEA's application:

- (1) Whether the LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application and has selected one of the four school intervention models identified in the final requirements (*i.e.*, turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model) to implement in each school.
- (2) Whether the LEA has demonstrated that it has the capacity to use SIG funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools. If an LEA claims it lacks sufficient capacity to serve each Tier I school, the SEA must evaluate the sufficiency of the LEA's claim.
- (3) Whether the LEA has submitted a budget that includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application as well as to support school improvement activities in Tier III schools throughout the period of availability of the funds (taking into account any waiver extending that period received by either the SEA or the LEA).

The SEA must also evaluate the actions an LEA has taken, or will take, to do the following:

- (1) Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.
- (2) Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.
- (3) Align other resources with the interventions.
- (4) Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively.

(5) Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

**I-3. May an SEA require an LEA to implement a particular intervention in one or more of its schools?**

No. An SEA may not require an LEA to implement a particular intervention in one or more of its Tier I and Tier II schools unless the SEA has taken over the school (or the LEA) in accordance with State law. Even if an LEA is required to implement an intervention other than the transformation model in one or more of its schools because the LEA has exceeded the cap with respect to the number of schools in which it can implement that model, the LEA has the discretion to determine the schools in which it will implement the transformation model and which of the other three interventions it will implement in its other Tier I and Tier II schools.

**I-4. May an SEA develop a needs assessment tool or rubric for all of its LEAs to use in determining which intervention will best address the needs of the Tier I and Tier II schools it commits to serve?**

Yes. Although an SEA is not obligated to develop a needs assessment that would be used on a statewide basis, it may choose to do so. The SEA could offer such a needs assessment as a technical assistance tool that would be available to LEAs that wish to use it or it could require all LEAs to use the same needs assessment in preparing their applications for SIG funds.

**I-5. What information related to the SIG program must an SEA post on its Web site?**

An SEA must post on its Web site all final LEA applications for SIG grants, including both applications that were approved and those that were rejected. An SEA does not have to post on its Web site initial versions of LEA applications that were replaced with updated versions (*e.g.*, to provide additional information requested by the SEA); the SEA need only post on its Web site the final versions of the applications.

In addition, an SEA must post on its Web site a summary of the SIG grants it awarded, including the following information:

- (1) Name and NCES identification number of each LEA awarded a grant;
- (2) Amount of each LEA's grant;
- (3) Name and NCES identification number of each school to be served; and
- (4) Type of intervention to be implemented in each Tier I and Tier II school being served.

**I-6. May an SEA award an LEA a lesser amount of SIG funds than the LEA requests in its application?**

Yes. An SEA's decision to award SIG funds to a particular LEA does not obligate the SEA to award the LEA all of the funds it requested. An SEA's decision to award fewer SIG funds than the LEA requested could come about in two different ways: (1) the SEA could decide to award fewer

funds than the LEA requested for each school the LEA commits to serve; or (2) the SEA could decide to award funds for only some of the schools the LEA commits to serve. For example, an SEA might decide to award fewer funds than the LEA requested if the SEA determines, for example, that the LEA has not properly analyzed the needs of its schools or identified appropriate services for the schools.

**I-7. What are examples of additional criteria an SEA may use to differentiate among Tier III schools when setting priorities among LEA applications for funding?**

An SEA might consider establishing criteria to target Tier III schools that are in the lowest-achieving sixth to tenth percentile in the State, to reward a Tier III school that would have been a Tier I school but has made progress over several years, or to focus on clusters of Tier III elementary schools that are feeder schools into Tier I and Tier II secondary schools. Note that these are only examples of criteria that an SEA might consider; an SEA should determine the criteria that work best for the State based on its unique needs.

**I-8. May an SEA take over an LEA or specific Tier I or Tier II schools?**

An SEA may, consistent with State law, take over an LEA or specific Tier I or Tier II schools in order to implement the interventions in the final requirements.

**I-9. What SIG funds may an SEA use to implement a school intervention model in a Tier I or Tier II school it has taken over?**

If an SEA has authority under State law to take over a Tier I or Tier II school, the SEA may retain the SIG funds that it would otherwise have allocated to an LEA for the school and use those funds to implement a school intervention model in the school.

**I-10. Under what circumstances may an SEA provide services directly to an eligible school?**

As authorized in section 1003(g)(7) of the ESEA, with the approval of the LEAs that would otherwise receive a SIG grant, an SEA may provide school improvement services directly or arrange for their provision through other entities such as school support teams or educational service agencies. This option may be particularly useful if an LEA lacks the capacity to implement any of the four intervention models itself in its Tier I and Tier II schools. An SEA may be better equipped than some LEAs, for example, to enter into a contract with an external provider to implement the restart model. Of course, the SEA must have the authority and capability, either directly or through an arrangement with an external provider, to implement one of the school intervention models in each Tier I or Tier II school in which it provides services directly. That is, the SEA must be able, for example, to govern the school, employ and evaluate staff, implement the instructional program, provide increased learning time, etc.

With respect to Tier III schools, an SEA may also provide school improvement services directly to eligible schools, with the approval of the LEAs that would otherwise receive a SIG grant. For example, an SEA may offer professional development from specific providers or “sell” technical assistance from the SEA’s school support teams.

If the SEA intends to provide services directly to any schools, the SEA must identify those schools in its SIG application to the Department and, for Tier I or Tier II schools, indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school, and provide evidence of the LEA's approval to have the SEA provide the services directly. If, at the time an SEA submits its application, it has not yet determined whether it will provide services directly to any schools, it may omit this information from its application. However, if the SEA later decides that it will provide such services, it must amend its application to provide the required information.

**I-11. If a Tier I or Tier II school meets the annual student achievement goals established by the LEA and makes progress on the leading indicators, must the SEA renew the LEA's SIG grant with respect to that school?**

Yes. Therefore, in awarding SIG grants, an SEA must apportion its SIG funds in a way that will enable it to renew each LEA's grant for additional one-year periods for the entire period of availability of the funds, taking into account any waivers to extend the period of availability that may have been requested and received by the SEA or an individual LEA.

**I-12. If a Tier I or Tier II school does not meet the annual student achievement goals established by the LEA, may an SEA renew the LEA's SIG grant with respect to that school?**

Yes. Even if a Tier I or Tier II school does not meet the annual student achievement goals established by the LEA, an SEA may renew the LEA's SIG grant with respect to that school if the school is making progress toward meeting those goals. Because it may be difficult for a persistently lowest-achieving school to show much improvement in academic achievement during the first year of implementing one of the school intervention models, an SEA has discretion to examine factors such as the school's progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements or the fidelity with which it is implementing the model in deciding whether to renew the LEA's SIG grant with respect to that school.

**I-13. May an SEA renew an LEA's SIG grant even if the SEA determines that one or more of its schools do not warrant renewed funding?**

Yes. Even if an SEA determines that one or more of an LEA's schools do not warrant renewed funding, the SEA may continue to award the LEA SIG funds for other eligible schools. The SEA would reduce the LEA's grant, however, by the amount allocated for the schools for which funding is not being renewed.

**I-14. Will an SEA be obligated to run another SIG competition for grants funded with FY 2010 funds (assuming the availability of appropriations)?**

Yes. Like the competition for the FY 2009 funds, the competition for FY 2010 funds, and any subsequent competition, must be conducted consistent with the final requirements.

**I-15. How must an SEA identify its Tier I and Tier II schools for purposes of any competition for SIG funds subsequent to the competition for FY 2009 funds?**

In identifying Tier I and Tier II schools in a State for purposes of allocating funds appropriated for SIG grants for any year subsequent to FY 2009, an SEA must exclude from consideration any

school that was previously identified as a Tier I or Tier II school and in which an LEA is implementing one of the four interventions identified in the final requirements using SIG funds.

**I-16. How can an SEA support its LEAs and schools with their implementation of the school intervention models discussed in the final requirements?**

An SEA can support its LEAs and Tier I and Tier II schools in implementing a school intervention model in a number of ways. These might include helping to identify and recruit new principals within and outside the State; recruiting CMOs and EMOs to the State to restart schools; providing model procedures for LEAs to use to screen and select high-quality external providers; working to reduce any State-level barriers that may impede an LEA's ability to implement a particular model; developing a model teacher evaluation system; researching instructional programs that have proven effective in low-achieving schools; and developing longitudinal data systems to enable schools to use data to identify the needs of individual students. The SEA can also support its Tier III schools by providing technical assistance, for example, through its school support teams.

**I-17. How do the final requirements for the SIG program impact an SEA that is participating in the Department's "differentiated accountability" pilot?**

An SEA that has been approved to participate in the differentiated accountability pilot may continue to do so. However, the SEA must ensure that its LEAs use SIG funds only to implement school intervention models in their Tier I or Tier II schools consistent with the final requirements. Thus, to the extent that a State's differentiated accountability plan is inconsistent with the final requirements, an LEA receiving SIG funds must use those funds in accordance with the final requirements, even if the State's differentiated accountability plan would permit greater flexibility. An SEA participating in the differentiated accountability pilot must assure that its LEAs use SIG funds in Tier I or Tier II schools consistent with the final requirements.

**I-18. In the absence of a waiver, when will the period of availability for FY 2009 SIG funds expire?**

In the absence of a waiver, the period of availability for FY 2009 SIG funds, including those appropriated through the "regular" allocation and those made available through the ARRA, expires September 30, 2011.

**J. SIG, RACE TO THE TOP, AND THE STATE FISCAL STABILIZATION FUND**

**J-1. How can a State design its Race to the Top and SIG plans to work in concert with one another?**

The SIG and Race to the Top programs are closely aligned, and a State can strengthen its Race to the Top application by demonstrating a similar alignment of its plans for implementing these two programs. SIG grants provide substantial funding that must be used primarily to implement the same school intervention models—turnaround, restart, school closure, and transformation—that are encouraged in the Race to the Top criteria.

In turn, successful implementation of the intervention models will be facilitated by key reforms that a State will carry out under Race to the Top. Each SEA should closely examine the requirements of

the four school intervention models in light of the criteria for a successful Race to the Top application. For example, State efforts to expand the use of data to improve instruction (one of the Race to the Top criteria) and activities to improve recruitment, training, and retention of teachers and principals (another Race to the Top criterion) will provide critical support for the effective implementation of the turnaround and transformation models.

In addition, State efforts to increase the number of high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools (one of the Race to the Top criteria) may help support local implementation of the restart model. An SEA might also strengthen its SIG implementation by making sure that Race to the Top reforms—such as the expanded use of data to improve instruction and teacher and principal evaluation systems—are implemented early in LEAs with large numbers of persistently lowest-achieving schools. Finally, an SEA may build on SIG grants, which may fund implementation of the models only in Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools, by using Race to the Top funds to pay for the implementation of school intervention models in schools that are not eligible to receive SIG funds.

**J-2. What has the Department done to support coordination across SIG, Race to the Top, and the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund program (SFSF)?**

To facilitate a State's ability to develop and implement consistent and coherent plans for turning around their persistently lowest-achieving schools, the Department has closely aligned the school intervention models and related definitions across SIG, Race to the Top and SFSF. In particular, the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" and the intervention models (turnaround model, restart model, school closure, and transformation model) are the same across all three programs.

**K. REPORTING METRICS**

**K-1. May an SEA add to the list of leading indicators in the final requirements?**

Yes. However, an SEA may not deny a request for renewal of a SIG grant with respect to a school that fails to make progress on any such additional leading indicators if the school has met its LEA's achievement goals and made progress on the leading indicators listed in the final requirements.

**K-2. Which of the reporting metrics are new for the SIG program and must be annually reported by an SEA receiving a SIG grant?**

The following reporting metrics are new for the SIG program and must be annually reported by school in each SEA receiving a SIG grant:

- (1) Which intervention the school used (*i.e.*, turnaround, restart, school closure, or transformation);
- (2) Number of minutes within the school year;
- (3) Average scale scores on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics, by grade, for the "all students" group, for each achievement quartile, and for each subgroup;